



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,212	11/29/2000	John H. Jerman	A-70056/ENB	4420

7590 01/30/2003

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Suite 3400
Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2828

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/728,212

Applicant(s)

JERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Armando Rodriguez

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 31-36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 11, 12, 14-22, 26-30, 37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23-25 and 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Paul JP
PAUL JP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

Applicant is advised that should claims 16,17 and 20 be found allowable, claim 21 and 22 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "means carried by the substrate" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2828

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9,14,15,18,26-30,37 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leckel et al in view of Dhuler et al (PN 6,428,173).

Regarding claims 1-8,1014,15,26-30,37 and 38,

Leckel et al illustrates in figure 2 a laser system used in optical communications network where the laser system having a source (10) which is in a Fabry-Perot arrangement by having reflective surfaces (20) and (30), a diffraction grating (70) and a mirror (270) where the grating and the mirror are in a Littman configuration for redirecting the beam back towards the grating, such configuration is well-known in the art. The mirror provides wavelength tuning as shown by the arrows in figure 2 and disclosed in column 5.

Leckel et al does not disclose a micro actuator for providing movement to the mirror to obtain a tunable laser.

Dhuler et al discloses in the abstract of microelectromechanical structures (MEMS) are used for controlling the movements of mirrors. Dhuler et al also discloses that such technology (MEMS) can be used in applications involving the controlled redirection of electromagnetic radiation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to combine the moveable microelectromechanical mirror of Dhuler et al with the laser system of Leckel et al because it would provide movement to the mirror of Leckel et al for controlling the retro reflected beam and obtaining a tunable laser.

Regarding claims 9 and 18,

Leckel et al in view of Dhuler et al discloses the claimed invention except for the second laser source and second microactuator. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a second laser source and a second microactuator, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. **St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.**

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leckel et al (PN 6,404,798) in view of Dhuler et al (PN 6,428,173) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jerman et al (PN 5,998,906).

Leckel et al and Dhuler et al do not disclose a microactuator having interdigitable comb fingers.

Jerman et al discloses an electrostatic microactuator having comb drive fingers, as described in the abstract.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the microactuator of Dhuler with the microactuator of Jerman et al because it would provide actuating the mirror with large forces.

Claims 16, 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leckel et al (PN 6,404,798) in view of Dhuler et al (PN 6,428,173) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mattori et al (PN 6,081,539).

The use of sensors and detectors to obtain an error signal by monitoring a predetermined wavelength of a laser system and maintaining such wavelength via a feedback circuit is well known and commonly used in the laser art, as shown by the external cavity tunable laser system of Mattori et al illustrated in figure 1.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leckel et al (PN 6,404,798) in view of Dhuler et al (PN 6,428,173) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Broutin et al (PN 6,198,757).

The use of electroabsorptive modulators (EML) in lasers for communication systems is well known in the laser art, as shown in figure 1 and disclosed in column 5 lines 6-11 of Broutin et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23-25 and 39 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: None of the prior arts alone or in combination discloses the claim invention having the limitations of dependent claim 23 and 39.

Regarding claims 23-25,

None of the prior arts alone or in combination discloses the claimed microactuator coupled to the collimating lens for moving the collimating lens.

Regarding claim 39,

None of the cited prior arts alone or in combination discloses the claimed microactuator having a counterbalance coupled to the microactuator and the reflective element for inhibiting undesirable movement.

Claims 13,31-36 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

None of the prior arts alone or in combination discloses the claimed tunable laser having the structural combination of independent claims 13 and 31.

Regarding claims 13,35 and 36,

None of the cited prior arts alone or in combination discloses the claimed tunable laser having the limitations cited in claim 13 in particular having a counterbalance carried by the substrate and coupled to the microactuator for inhibiting undesirable movement.

Regarding claims 31-34,


None of the cited prior arts alone or in combination discloses the claimed tunable laser having the limitations cited in claim 31 in particular having a microactuator coupled to the collimating lens for moving the collimating lens to enhance the return of the light to the laser source.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Armando Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 308-6218. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-hour day / M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-4881.



Armando Rodriguez
Examiner
Art Unit 2828



Paul Ip
Supervisor
Art Unit 2828

AR/PI
January 22, 2003